

REMARKS

Claims 10-28 are in the application. Claim 10 is amended to correct a minor error of apparent nature. Entry of the amendment presents no new issues and places the application in better condition for allowance.

All of the claims are finally rejected on new grounds under Section 103 based on the combination of Dutta (U.S. Pub 2002/0073204) in view of Iwami (U.S. No. 5,315,705). Applicants respectfully disagree. Reconsideration is requested because the rejection does not correctly apply the prior art. For example, claim 10 requires

... search functions integrated in a plurality of the components
... a first search message
... a second search message ... [and that]
the communication components responding to the second search message
forward the second search message to other communication components.

The rejection cites Par [0037] of Dutta for purportedly disclosing forwarding the second search message according to the above recitation, but it is clear from the citation that Par [0037] does not at all pertain to a **second** search message. In fact, there is no reason, based on the disclosure of Dutta, that there would be such a forwarding of a second search message. In contrast to the art of record, it is only the applicants that teach embodiments enabled by forwarding the second **search** message.

As stated for an embodiment at Par [0029] of the patent application, the first search message includes information that the communication component is **searching for other components which support the search method**, and it is the second search message which (i) includes information about what type of resource is being sought, (ii) such that when the component which first receives the second message does not have that resource, that component forwards the second message to other **components which support the search method**, i.e., have the search functions. Nor does the Dutta reference pertain to search functions for ascertaining addresses of components having a communication service.

Thus the Dutta reference is deficient in at least two ways relative to the network of claim 10. First, as acknowledged by the Examiner, the reference does not relate to finding of

communications components and, secondly, the reference does not disclose use of searching to find other components to send search messages to. Reliance upon Iwami does not compensate for these deficiencies, as the citation from Iwami (col. 1, line 37 – col. 2, line 19; col. 3, lines 6-34) does not at all relate to the search functions which are lacking in Dutta. In fact, the Examiner has not explained how any of the recitations in cols 1, 2 and 3 of Iwami might be applied to form a combination which could be used to reject the claims. Applicants contend there is no basis for making a combination which reads on claim 10. The same is true for claim 28, which, for example, requires:

at least one of the communication components which is able to provide the required gateway resource responds to the **second** search message ...

Also, with regard to claim 13, wherein the second search message is designed to ascertain the information stored in a communication component about the usable resources of the communication components, the Examiner is again reminded that the recited “resources” are expressly defined as including “a communication service” such that there is no support for finding a search message as recited by the applicants.

The prior art does not disclose the claimed combinations. Nor is it seen that any of the claimed combinations can be reconstructed (even in hindsight) from the applied combination of references. More is required to reject the claims. It is incumbent upon the Examiner to show the invention in full detail by **citing all requisite support**. This has not and cannot be accomplished with the combination of Dutta and Iwami. Therefore the final rejection must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants have provided good reason for withdrawal of the rejections. It is urged that the application is in condition for allowance. The rejections of all of the claims is in error and the Examiner is requested to either allow the claims or to issue an advisory action which is fully responsive to all of these deficiencies.

Serial No. 10/520,715
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P02867WOUS

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 23, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830